20 December, 2015 *JCAP* **03** (2016) 003 [arXiv:1512.06497]

arXiv:1512.06497v2 [gr-qc] 2 Mar 2016

Conical singularities and the Vainshtein screening in full GLPV theories

Ryotaro Kase,[a] **Shinji Tsujikawa**[a] **and Antonio De Felice**[b]

[a]Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Tokyo University of Science, 1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

[b]Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, 606-8502, Kyoto, Japan

E-mail: r.kase@rs.tus.ac.jp, shinji@rs.kagu.tus.ac.jp, antonio.defelice@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract. In Gleyzes-Langlois-Piazza-Vernizzi (GLPV) theories, it is known that the conical singularity arises at the center of a spherically symmetric body ($r = 0$) in the case where the parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ characterizing the deviation from the Horndeski Lagrangian L_4 approaches a non-zero constant as $r \to 0$. We derive spherically symmetric solutions around the center in full GLPV theories and show that the GLPV Lagrangian L_5 does not modify the divergent property of the Ricci scalar R induced by the non-zero $\alpha_{\rm H4}$. Provided that $\alpha_{\rm H4} = 0$, curvature scalar quantities can remain finite at $r = 0$ even in the presence of L_5 beyond the Horndeski domain. For the theories in which the scalar field ϕ is directly coupled to R, we also obtain spherically symmetric solutions inside/outside the body to study whether the fifth force mediated by ϕ can be screened by non-linear field self-interactions. We find that there is one specific model of GLPV theories in which the effect of L_5 vanishes in the equations of motion. We also show that, depending on the sign of a L_5-dependent term in the field equation, the model can be compatible with solar-system constraints under the Vainshtein mechanism or it is plagued by the problem of a divergence of the field derivative in high-density regions.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Background equations of motion **3**

3 Appearance of the conical singularity at the center of a compact body **5**
3.1 Models with a conical singularity 6
3.2 Requirements for the absence of singularities at the origin 7

4 Effect of the Lagrangian L_5 on the conical singularity **8**
4.1 $F_5 = 0$ 9
4.2 $F_5 \neq 0$ 10

5 Solutions inside/outside the compact body and the screening mechanism **11**
5.1 Concrete model 12
5.2 Model with $s_5 = 0$ 16
5.3 Model with $s_5 \neq 0$ 17
5.3.1 $s_5 > 0$ 18
5.3.2 $s_5 < 0$ 20

6 Conclusions **21**

1 Introduction

Over the past century, General Relativity (GR) has persistently been the fundamental theory for describing the gravitational interaction with matter. The standard model of particle physics has also been the backbone of high energy physics along with the discovery of the Higgs particle. Nevertheless, unifying gravity with other forces in Nature is still a challenging task. Moreover, the observational evidence of a late-time cosmic acceleration [1, 2] implies that the gravitational law may be modified on infra-red scales to realize an effective negative pressure against gravity [3–5].

The cosmological constant arising from the vacuum energy of particle physics can lead to the cosmic acceleration, but its energy scale is vastly larger than the observed dark energy scale [6]. An alternative approach to explaining the Universe acceleration (for both dark energy and inflation) is to introduce a scalar field ϕ beyond the standard model of particle physics [7]. Such a scalar field can be generally coupled to gravity [8, 9] through interactions like $G_4(\phi, X)R$ and $G_5(\phi, X)G_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\mu\nabla^\nu\phi$, where $G_{4,5}(\phi, X)$ are functions of ϕ and $X = \nabla_\mu\phi\nabla^\mu\phi$ (∇_μ is the covariant derivative operator), R is the Ricci scalar, and $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor.

The X-dependent couplings with R and $G_{\mu\nu}$ can give rise to equations of motion containing derivatives higher than second order [10]. In such cases, the ghost-like Ostrogradski instability [11] arises, in general, due to the Hamiltonian being unbounded from below. One can formulate the action of the most general scalar-tensor theories with second-order equations of motion by adding terms that cancel higher-order derivatives [12]. Such a general action was first derived by Horndeski in 1974 [13] and it received much attention after 2011 in connection to the problems of inflation and dark energy [14–19].

In Horndeski theories, there is only one propagating scalar degree of freedom (DOF) besides the two graviton polarizations. If we go beyond the Horndeski domain, then the theories have derivatives higher than second order, but this does not necessarily increase the number of propagating DOF. In fact, Gleyzes-Langlois-Piazza-Vernizzi (GLPV) expressed the Horndeski Lagrangian in terms of the 3+1 Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) decomposition of space-time [20] by choosing the unitary gauge [21] and derived more general theories without imposing the two conditions that Horndeski theories satisfy [22]. According to the Hamiltonian analysis in the unitary gauge, the GLPV theories have only one scalar DOF [22–25]. The recent full gauge-invariant analysis of Ref. [26] also supports this claim.

The GLPV theories were applied to the spherically symmetric background [27–33] as well as to the cosmological setup relevant to dark energy [34–41]. The main motivation for the derivation of spherically symmetric solutions is to understand how the screening of the fifth force mediated by the scalar DOF works to recover the General Relativistic behavior inside the solar system [42]. In Horndeski theories up to the Lagrangian L_4 (involving the non-minimal coupling $G_4(\phi, X)R$), it is known that non-linear scalar-field self-interactions associated with Galileons [10, 43] can lead to the suppression of the fifth force around a compact body [28, 44–47] through the Vainshtein mechanism [48]. The Horndeski Lagrangian L_5, which contains the derivative coupling $G_5(\phi, X)G_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\mu\nabla^\nu\phi$, generally prevents the success of the Vainshtein mechanism in high-density regions [19, 49, 50].

In GLPV theories, up to the Lagrangian L_4, it was found that a conical singularity arises at the center of a spherically symmetric body ($r = 0$) for the models in which the parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$, characterizing the departure from Horndeski theories, approaches a non-zero constant as $r \to 0$ [32]. This singularity is related with the geometric modification of the four-dimensional Ricci scalar R expressed in terms of the three dimensional extrinsic and intrinsic curvatures appearing in the ADM formalism. To avoid the divergence of curvature invariants at $r = 0$ for spherically symmetric solutions, the deviation parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ was required to vanish for $r \to 0$ (whereas $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ can be non-zero for $r > 0$). In fact, it is possible to construct dark energy models without the conical singularity in GLPV theories, while satisfying cosmological and local gravity constraints [41].

Since the analysis of Ref. [32] is restricted to the up-to-L_4 sub-class of GLPV theories, it remains to be seen what happens around the center of a compact body in the full GLPV theories containing the Lagrangian L_5. This is the issue addressed in the present paper. In particular, our first interest is to show whether the conical singularity induced by the non-vanishing $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ at $r = 0$ is affected by the addition of L_5. Secondly, we would like to see whether the Lagrangian L_5 outside the Horndeski domain can induce other curvature singularities at $r = 0$. In order to avoid that the divergence of curvature invariants (such as R) may occur because of the unphysical choice of free functions on spherically symmetric backgrounds, we consider those GLPV theories whose action remains finite in the limit $X \to 0$ with the regular boundary condition $d\phi/dr = 0$ at $r = 0$.

In addition to the derivation of spherically symmetric solutions around $r = 0$, we also obtain solutions inside/outside the compact body by taking into account a non-minimal coupling between ϕ and R. This is for the purpose of addressing whether the Vainshtein mechanism is at work in the presence of the GLPV Lagrangian L_5. In the GLPV domain, there is one particular model in which the coefficient s_5 arising from L_5 disappears in the field equations of motion. Depending on the sign of s_5, we find that the model can be compatible with solar-system constraints under the operation of the Vainshtein mechanism or it suffers from divergent behavior of the field derivative in regions of high density.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 the equations of motion in full GLPV theories are derived on the spherically symmetric background by introducing quantities associated with the Lagrangian in the ADM formalism. In Sec. 3 we first review how the conical singularity arises in the theories up to the Lagrangian L_4 and then obtain general conditions for avoiding the divergence of curvature invariants at $r = 0$. In Sec. 4 we study how the existence of the Lagrangian L_5 in both Horndeski and GLPV theories affects the problem of the conical singularity at $r = 0$. In Sec. 5 we derive spherically symmetric solutions both inside and outside the body on account of the non-minimal coupling between ϕ and R. We discuss conditions under which the model with the Lagrangian L_5 can be compatible with local gravity constraints through the operation of the Vainshtein mechanism. Sec. 6 is devoted to conclusions.

2 Background equations of motion

The action of GLPV theories [22] is given by

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\sum_{i=2}^{5} L_i + \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\, L_m(g_{\mu\nu}, \Psi_m)\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where g is the determinant of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, L_m is a matter Lagrangian with matter fields Ψ_m, and

$$L_2 = G_2(\phi, X)\,, \tag{2.2}$$

$$L_3 = G_3(\phi, X)\Box\phi\,, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_4 = {} & G_4(\phi, X)R - 2G_{4,X}(\phi, X)\left[(\Box\phi)^2 - \nabla^\mu\nabla^\nu\phi\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\phi\right] \\ & + F_4(\phi, X)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_{\mu'\nu'\rho'\sigma}\nabla^{\mu'}\phi\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla^{\nu'}\nabla_\nu\phi\nabla^{\rho'}\nabla_\rho\phi\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_5 = {} & G_5(\phi, X)G_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\mu\nabla^\nu\phi \\ & + \frac{1}{3}G_{5,X}(\phi, X)\left[(\Box\phi)^3 - 3\Box\phi\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\phi\nabla^\mu\nabla^\nu\phi + 2\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\phi\nabla^\sigma\nabla^\mu\phi\nabla_\sigma\nabla^\nu\phi\right] \\ & + F_5(\phi, X)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_{\mu'\nu'\rho'\sigma'}\nabla^{\mu'}\phi\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla^{\nu'}\nabla_\nu\phi\nabla^{\rho'}\nabla_\rho\phi\nabla^{\sigma'}\nabla_\sigma\phi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Here $G_i(\phi, X)$ $(i = 2, 3, 4, 5)$ and $F_j(\phi, X)$ $(j = 4, 5)$ are functions of the scalar field ϕ and its kinetic term $X \equiv \nabla^\mu\phi\nabla_\mu\phi$, R is the Ricci scalar, $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor, $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor, and a comma represents the partial derivative with respect to ϕ or X, e.g., $G_{4,X} \equiv \partial G_4/\partial X$. We use the metric signature $(-, +, +, +)$. Horndeski theories correspond to the choice $F_4 = F_5 = 0$.

The action (2.1) was discovered by expressing the Horndeski action in terms of the 3+1 ADM decomposition of space-time by choosing the unitary gauge ($\phi = \phi(t)$) for a time-like scalar field [21, 51, 52] and by generalizing it without imposing the two conditions Horndeski theories obey [22]. In terms of the extrinsic curvature $K_{\mu\nu}$ and the intrinsic curvature $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}$, the Lagrangian of GLPV theories on such a background is simply given by

$$L = A_2 + A_3K + A_4(K^2 - K_{\mu\nu}K^{\mu\nu}) + B_4\mathcal{R} + A_5\mathcal{K} + B_5\left(K^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{K\mathcal{R}}{2}\right)\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where $K \equiv g^{\mu\nu}K_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{K} \equiv K^3 - 3KK^{\mu\nu}K_{\mu\nu} + 2K_{\mu\nu}K^{\mu\rho}K^{\nu}{}_{\rho}$, and $\mathcal{R} \equiv g^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}$. The functions $A_{2,3,4,5}$ and $B_{4,5}$ are related with $G_{2,3,4,5}$ and $F_{4,5}$ in Eqs. (2.2)-(2.5) according to

$$A_2 = G_2 - XE_{3,\phi}\,, \tag{2.7}$$

$$A_3 = 2|X|^{3/2}\left(E_{3,X} + \frac{G_{4,\phi}}{X}\right)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

$$A_4 = -G_4 + 2XG_{4,X} + \frac{X}{2}G_{5,\phi} - X^2F_4\,, \tag{2.9}$$

$$B_4 = G_4 + \frac{X}{2}(G_{5,\phi} - E_{5,\phi})\,, \tag{2.10}$$

$$A_5 = -|X|^{3/2}\left(XF_5 + \frac{G_{5,X}}{3}\right)\,, \tag{2.11}$$

$$B_5 = \frac{|X|^{3/2}}{X}E_5\,, \tag{2.12}$$

where $E_3(\phi, X)$ and $E_5(\phi, X)$ are auxiliary functions satisfying

$$G_3 = E_3 + 2XE_{3,X}\,, \qquad G_{5,X} = \frac{E_5}{2X} + E_{5,X}\,. \tag{2.13}$$

These auxiliary functions were introduced in Ref. [21] for the convenience of rewriting Horndeski Lagrangians in the ADM form. The relations (2.7)-(2.12) were first derived for the isotropic cosmological background with $X < 0$ [22]. Even for the background with $X > 0$, we can use the functions $A_{2,3,4,5}$ and $B_{4,5}$ in (2.7)-(2.12) to obtain equations of motion simpler than those derived with the functions $G_{2,3,4,5}$ and $F_{4,5}$. Since our interest in this paper is the spherically symmetric solutions, we focus on the case $X > 0$ in the following discussion.

We have the following relations

$$A_4 + B_4 - 2XB_{4,X} = -X^2F_4\,, \tag{2.14}$$

$$A_5 + \frac{1}{3}XB_{5,X} = -X|X|^{3/2}F_5\,. \tag{2.15}$$

The two relations, $F_4 = 0$ and $F_5 = 0$, which define the Horndeski theories, correspond to $A_4 + B_4 - 2XB_{4,X} = 0$ and $A_5 + XB_{5,X}/3 = 0$, respectively. Therefore, the functions F_4 and F_5 characterize the deviation from Horndeski theories.

We consider the spherically symmetric and static space-time described by the line-element

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\Psi(r)}dt^2 + e^{2\Phi(r)}dr^2 + r^2\left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\varphi^2\right)\,, \tag{2.16}$$

where $\Psi(r)$ and $\Phi(r)$ are the gravitational potentials depending on the radius r from the center of symmetry. As for the matter Lagrangian we consider a perfect fluid whose energy-momentum tensor is given by $T^{\mu}_{\nu} = \mathrm{diag}\,(-\rho_m, P_m, P_m, P_m)$, where ρ_m is the energy density and P_m is the pressure. Variation of the action (2.1) leads to the following equations of

motion

$$\left(\frac{4e^{-2\Phi}A_4}{r}-\mathcal{C}_1+4\mathcal{C}_2+\mathcal{D}_1+\mathcal{D}_2\right)\Phi'-A_2+\mathcal{C}_3-\mathcal{C}_4-\mathcal{D}_3$$
$$-\frac{2(e^{-2\Phi}-1-\alpha_{\rm t4})A_4}{r^2}=-\rho_m\,, \tag{2.17}$$
$$\left(\frac{4e^{-2\Phi}A_4}{r}-\mathcal{C}_1+4\mathcal{C}_2+\mathcal{D}_1+\mathcal{D}_2\right)\Psi'+A_2-2XA_{2,X}-\frac{2(\mathcal{C}_1-\mathcal{C}_2)}{r}$$
$$+\frac{2(e^{-2\Phi}-1-\alpha_{\rm H4})A_4}{r^2}=-P_m\,, \tag{2.18}$$
$$\left(2e^{-2\Phi}A_4+\mathcal{D}_4\right)(\Psi''+\Psi'^2)-\left[2e^{-2\Phi}A_4+2\mathcal{D}_4+r(2\mathcal{C}_2+\mathcal{D}_1)\right]\Psi'\Phi'+A_2-\mathcal{C}_3+\frac{\mathcal{C}_4}{2}$$
$$+\left(\frac{2e^{-2\Phi}A_4}{r}+\frac{\mathcal{C}_4}{2}r+\mathcal{D}_5\right)\Psi'-\left(\frac{2e^{-2\Phi}A_4}{r}-\mathcal{C}_1+2\mathcal{C}_2\right)\Phi'=-P_m\,, \tag{2.19}$$
$$P_m'+\Psi'(\rho_m+P_m)=0\,, \tag{2.20}$$

where a prime represents a derivative with respect to r, and

$$\mathcal{C}_1\equiv 2Xe^{-\Phi}A_{3,X}\,,\qquad \mathcal{C}_2\equiv\frac{2e^{-2\Phi}XA_{4,X}}{r}\,,$$
$$\mathcal{C}_3\equiv e^{-\Phi}\phi'(A_{3,\phi}+2e^{-2\Phi}\phi''A_{3,X})\,,\qquad \mathcal{C}_4\equiv\frac{4e^{-2\Phi}\phi'(A_{4,\phi}+2e^{-2\Phi}\phi''A_{4,X})}{r}\,,$$
$$\mathcal{D}_1=\frac{12e^{-3\Phi}XA_{5,X}}{r^2}\,,\qquad \mathcal{D}_2=\frac{2e^{-\Phi}}{r^2}\left(6e^{-2\Phi}A_5+XB_{5,X}\right)\,,$$
$$\mathcal{D}_3\equiv\frac{2e^{-3\Phi}\phi'\phi''(6e^{-2\Phi}A_{5,X}+B_{5,X})+e^{-\Phi}\phi'(6e^{-2\Phi}A_{5,\phi}+B_{5,\phi})}{r^2}\,,$$
$$\mathcal{D}_4=\frac{6e^{-3\Phi}A_5}{r}\,,\qquad \mathcal{D}_5\equiv\frac{6e^{-3\Phi}\phi'(A_{5,\phi}+2e^{-2\Phi}\phi''A_{5,X})}{r}\,, \tag{2.21}$$

and

$$\alpha_{\rm t4}\equiv-\frac{B_4}{A_4}-1\,, \tag{2.22}$$
$$\alpha_{\rm H4}\equiv\frac{2XB_{4,X}-B_4}{A_4}-1=\frac{X^2F_4}{A_4}\,. \tag{2.23}$$

The parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ characterizes the deviation of the GLPV theories from the Horndeski domain for the Lagrangians up to L_4. In the presence of L_5, the difference between A_5 and $-XB_{5,X}/3$ also gives rise to the departure from the Horndeski domain, but we will show that the deviation from the L_4 sector is crucial for the appearance of the conical singularity.

3 Appearance of the conical singularity at the center of a compact body

The conical singularity found in Ref. [32] appears at the center of a compact body in the case where the parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ approaches a non-vanishing constant as $r\to 0$. This happens for the simple model in which $-A_4$ and B_4 are non-zero constants different from each other. In the following, we first review how the conical singularity arises in such a simple model and then discuss general conditions for avoiding the divergence of curvature scalar quantities.

3.1 Models with a conical singularity

Let us begin with the model of a massless scalar field characterized by the functions

$$A_2 = -\frac{1}{2}X\,, \quad A_3 = 0\,, \quad A_4 = -\frac{1}{1+\alpha_{\rm H4}}G_4\,, \quad B_4 = G_4\,, \quad A_5 = B_5 = 0\,, \tag{3.1}$$

where G_4 and $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ ($=\alpha_{\rm t4}$) are constants. This is arguably the simplest extension of GR ($-A_4 = B_4 = M_{\rm pl}^2/2$, where $M_{\rm pl}$ is the reduced Planck mass) to the domain of GLPV theories ($\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$).

We consider a spherically symmetric body and derive the solutions to Eqs. (2.17)-(2.20) around its center ($r = 0$). In doing so, we expand the gravitational potentials and the scalar field around $r = 0$, as

$$\Phi(r) = \Phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Phi_i r^i\,, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Psi(r) = \Psi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Psi_i r^i\,, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\phi(r) = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \phi_i r^i\,, \tag{3.4}$$

where Φ_0, Φ_i, Ψ_0, Ψ_i, ϕ_0, and ϕ_i are constants. In Eq. (3.4) the linear term proportional to r is absent to respect the regular boundary condition $\phi'(0) = 0$. In GR the linear terms of $\Phi(r)$ and $\Psi(r)$ also vanish. This will in general happen also for the GLPV theories, as we shall see later on.

For constant ρ_m, we can integrate Eq. (2.20) to give

$$P_m(r) = -\rho_m + \rho_s e^{-\Psi(r)}\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where ρ_s is a constant. If the density depends on r, we can expand $\rho_m(r)$ in the form $\rho_m(r) = \rho_0 + \rho_1 r^2 + \cdots$ around $r = 0$. This difference does not affect the discussion of the conical singularity given below, so we shall focus on the case of constant ρ_m up to the end of Sec. 4. In Sec. 5 we study the case in which the density varies as a function of r in order to discuss the behavior of the solutions inside and outside the body.

Substituting Eqs. (3.2)-(3.5) into Eqs. (2.17)-(2.19), we can iteratively derive the coefficients of $\Phi(r)$, $\Psi(r)$, and $\phi(r)$. For the model (3.1) we obtain the following solutions

$$\Phi(r) = -\frac{1}{2}\ln(1+\alpha_{\rm H4}) + \frac{\rho_m}{12G_4}r^2 + \frac{\rho_m^2}{144G_4^2}r^4 + \mathcal{O}(r^6)\,, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\Psi(r) = \Psi_0 - \frac{2\rho_m e^{\Psi_0} - 3\rho_s}{24G_4 e^{\Psi_0}}r^2 - \frac{(4e^{\Psi_0}\rho_m - 3\rho_s)(2e^{\Psi_0}\rho_m - 3\rho_s)}{1152G_4^2 e^{2\Psi_0}}r^4 + \mathcal{O}(r^6)\,, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\phi(r) = \phi_0\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Since the coefficients ϕ_i (where $i \geq 2$) vanish, the scalar field is constant around $r = 0$. On using these solutions, the Ricci scalar is given by

$$R = -\frac{2\alpha_{\rm H4}}{r^2} + \frac{(4\rho_m e^{\Psi_0} - 3\rho_s)(1+\alpha_{\rm H4})}{2G_4 e^{\Psi_0}} + \mathcal{O}(r^2)\,. \tag{3.9}$$

For the theories with $\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$, there is the conical singularity associated with the divergence of R. This singularity arises independently of the choice of the integration constants ρ_s, Ψ_0, and ϕ_0.

3.2 Requirements for the absence of singularities at the origin

In Sec. 3.1 we have shown the existence of the conical singularity for the simple model (3.1), but this property is generic for the models in which the parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ approaches a non-zero constant as $r \to 0$. On using the expansions (3.2)-(3.4) for general models, the Ricci scalar R around $r = 0$ reads

$$R = \frac{2(1-e^{-2\Phi_0})}{r^2} + \frac{4(2\Phi_1-\Psi_1)e^{-2\Phi_0}}{r} - 2(6\Phi_1^2+\Psi_1^2-5\Phi_1\Psi_1-6\Phi_2+6\Psi_2)e^{-2\Phi_0}+\mathcal{O}(r)\,. \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, the gravitational potentials up to first order in r are intrinsically related to the divergence of R. The Ricci scalar remains finite under the two conditions

$$\Phi_0 = 0\,, \quad (3.11)$$
$$2\Phi_1 = \Psi_1\,. \quad (3.12)$$

On account of the two conditions (3.11) and (3.12), we also find

$$R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} = \frac{22\Phi_1^2}{r^2} - \frac{8\Phi_1\left(9\,\Phi_1^2-4\,\Phi_2-4\,\Psi_2\right)}{r} + \frac{400}{3}\Phi_1^4 - 8\Phi_1^2\left(25\Phi_2+11\Psi_2\right) + 48\left(\Phi_2^2-\Phi_2\Psi_2+\Psi_2^2\right) + 4\Phi_1\left(11\Phi_3+15\Psi_3\right)+\mathcal{O}(r)\,, \quad (3.13)$$

$$R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{56\Phi_1^2}{r^2} - \frac{64\Phi_1\left(3\,\Phi_1^2-\Phi_2-\Psi_2\right)}{r} + \frac{1120}{3}\Phi_1^4 - 32\Phi_1^2\left(12\Phi_2+7\Psi_2\right) + 48\left(\Phi_2^2+\Psi_2^2\right) + 16\Phi_1\left(5\Phi_3+6\Psi_3\right)+\mathcal{O}(r)\,, \quad (3.14)$$

so that the singularity is absent at $r = 0$ if and only if $\Phi_1 = 0 = \Psi_1$, as it also happens in GR.

In summary, the static object does not possess curvature singularities at $r = 0$ if

$$\Phi_0 = 0\,, \quad (3.15)$$
$$\Phi_1 = 0\,, \quad (3.16)$$
$$\Psi_1 = 0\,. \quad (3.17)$$

For the solutions (3.6)-(3.7) we have that $e^{-2\Phi_0} = 1+\alpha_{\rm H4}$ and $\Phi_1 = \Psi_1 = 0$, so the first condition (3.15) is violated for $\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$.

In GLPV theories up to the Lagrangians L_4, one can generalize the model (3.1) in such a way that additional contributions to the functions A_2, A_3, A_4, B_4 are present. Introducing the cosmological constant $-\Lambda$ in A_2, we have additional r^2-dependent contributions to Eqs. (3.6)-(3.7). However, this does not modify the existence of the conical singularity.

If we take into account additional X-dependent terms like $A_i \propto X^i$ (where $i \geq 1$), it follows that the coefficients $\mathcal{C}_{1,2,3}$ in Eq. (2.21) vanish for $r \to 0$ with the field profile (3.4) satisfying the boundary condition $\phi'(0) = 0$. On using the properties $\phi'(r) \simeq 2\phi_2 r$ and $\phi''(r) \simeq 2\phi_2$ around $r = 0$ for the function A_4 containing $\beta_4 X$ (β_4 is a constant), the coefficient $\mathcal{C}_4$ in Eq. (2.21) approaches a constant value $32\beta_4\phi_2^2 e^{-4\Phi_0}$ as $r \to 0$. Apparently the constant $\mathcal{C}_4$ can be absorbed into A_2 in Eq. (2.17), but we need to caution that it appears differently in Eq. (2.19) with an extra contribution $\mathcal{C}_4/2$ relative to A_2. To address this issue, we first derived the solutions to Φ and Ψ iteratively by expanding Eqs. (2.17)-(2.18) up to quadratic order in r and then substituted them into Eq. (2.19). This second step leads to the equality $\mathcal{C}_4/2 + c\phi_2^2 r^2 + \mathcal{O}(r^3) = 0$, where c is a non-zero constant. Since the term $c\phi_2^2 r^2$ needs

to vanish, we obtain $\phi_2 = 0$. Under this condition the first term $\mathcal{C}_4/2 = 16\beta_4\phi_2^2 e^{-4\Phi_0}$ vanishes identically, so there is no inconsistency for the extra term $\mathcal{C}_4/2$ mentioned above. For the theories with additional terms $-\Lambda$ in A_2 and $\beta_4 X$ in A_4 to the functions (3.1), the resulting gravitational potentials correspond to Eqs. (3.6)-(3.7) with the replacement $\rho_m \to \rho_m + \Lambda$.

Another possibility is to take into account the ϕ-dependence in the functions A_2, A_3, A_4, and B_4. Since $\phi(r)$ approaches a constant as $r \to 0$, an additional ϕ-dependent contribution to A_2 behaves as the cosmological constant Λ discussed above. Similarly, in the limit that $r \to 0$, $\mathcal{C}_3$ vanishes and $\mathcal{C}_4$ approaches a constant, so addition of ϕ-dependent terms in A_3 and A_4 does not affect the existence of the conical singularity. We note that the ϕ-dependence in A_4 and B_4 leads to the variation of the scalar field such that ϕ_2 is a non-zero constant in Eq. (3.4) [32] (as we will see in Sec. 5). However, this does not modify the solutions (3.6)-(3.7) up to first order in r.

4 Effect of the Lagrangian L_5 on the conical singularity

We study how the Lagrangian L_5 affects the problem of the conical singularity discussed in Sec. 3. The quantities A_5 and B_5 appearing in Eqs. (2.17)-(2.19) are related with the functions G_5 and F_5 in the Lagrangian (2.5), as Eqs. (2.11) and (2.12). Let us consider the functional form of $G_5(\phi, X)$ given by

$$G_5(\phi, X) = \sum_{n=0} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{n/2}\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where $g_{n/2}(\phi)$ is an arbitrary function of ϕ, and n (≥ 0) is an integer. The choice of the power $n/2$ in $X = e^{-2\Phi}\phi'^2$ comes from the fact that we would like to take into account the terms with odd powers of ϕ' in addition to even powers. The function (4.1) can encompass most of the models with the Lagrangian L_5 proposed in the literature. For example, we have $G_5(\phi) = g_0(\phi) \propto \phi$ for the non-minimal derivative coupling model [53, 54], $G_5(X) = g_2 X^2$ for covariant Galileons [10], and $G_5(X) = g_m X^m$ ($m \geq 1$) for extended Galileons [55].

For the purpose of studying the singularity problem around the center of a compact body, the function (4.1) is sufficiently general as it can be regarded as the expansion of a regular function G_5 around $r = 0$. Note that, for the finiteness of the action (2.1) in the limit $\phi' \to 0$, G_5 should not contain negative powers of X^m. Since the leading-order term of the field derivative is given by $\phi'(r) \propto r$, it follows that the r.h.s. of Eq. (4.1) can be expanded as $G_5 = g_0 + \sum_{i=1} G_{5i}\, r^i$, where G_{5i}'s are constants. This is of the same form as the expansions (3.2)-(3.3) of $\Phi(r)$ and $\Psi(r)$ around $r = 0$.

The auxiliary function E_5 defined by Eq. (2.13) reads

$$E_5 = \mathcal{B}(\phi) X^{-1/2} + \sum_{n=1} \frac{n}{n+1} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{n/2}\,, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\phi)$ is a function of ϕ arising from the integral with respect to X. Since the arbitrariness of the function $\mathcal{B}(\phi)$ should not affect the background equations of motion through the term $B_{5,\phi}$, we focus on the case in which $\mathcal{B}$ does not depend on ϕ. From Eqs. (2.11) and (2.12), it follows that

$$A_5 = -X^{5/2} F_5 - \sum_{n=1} \frac{n}{6} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{(n+1)/2}\,, \tag{4.3}$$

$$B_5 = \mathcal{B} + \sum_{n=1} \frac{n}{n+1} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{(n+1)/2}\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $F_5 = 0$ in Horndeski theories, the function A_5 does not contain a non-zero constant term. In GLPV theories it is possible to have constant A_5 for the choice $F_5(\phi) = c_5 X^{-5/2}$, where c_5 is a constant. For the finiteness of the action (2.1) in the limit $X \to 0$, we require that both A_5 and B_5 do not involve the negative powers of X^m [which is the case for B_5 in Eq. (4.4)]. As we will see later in Sec. 4.2, this restricts the functional form of F_5.

The existence of the term $G_5(\phi, X)$ also gives rise to modifications to the functions A_4 and B_4, as

$$A_4 = \frac{1}{1+\alpha_{\rm H4}} \left[-G_4 + 2XG_{4,X} + \sum_{n=0} \frac{1}{2} g_{n/2,\phi}(\phi) X^{n/2+1} \right] , \tag{4.5}$$

$$B_4 = G_4 + \sum_{n=0} \frac{1}{2(n+1)} g_{n/2,\phi}(\phi) X^{n/2+1} , \tag{4.6}$$

where we used Eq. (2.23). For example, the non-minimal derivative coupling model corresponds to $g_0(\phi) = c_0\phi$ and $g_{n/2}(\phi) = 0$ for $n \geq 1$. In this case, the terms proportional to X are present in Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6). As we already discussed in Sec. 3.2, this additional term does not modify the existence of the conical singularity at $r = 0$. This is also the case for the function (4.1) containing the terms with the power $n \geq 1$.

4.1 $F_5 = 0$

To study the effect of the terms A_5 and B_5 on the equations of motion (2.17)-(2.19), we first discuss the case $F_5 = 0$. Picking up one term in Eq. (4.1), i.e., $G_5(\phi, X) = g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{n/2}$, it follows that

$$A_5 = -\frac{n}{6} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{(n+1)/2} , \tag{4.7}$$

$$B_5 = \mathcal{B} + \frac{n}{n+1} g_{n/2}(\phi) X^{(n+1)/2} , \tag{4.8}$$

where $n \geq 1$. For $n = 0$ the terms A_5 and B_5 do not provide any contribution to the equations of motion, but the effect of L_5 appears through the functions A_4 and B_4. As discussed in Sec. 3.1, we consider the model of a massless scalar field characterized by the functions

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= -\frac{1}{2} X , \qquad A_3 = 0 , \\ A_4 &= \frac{1}{1+\alpha_{\rm H4}} \left[-G_4 + \frac{1}{2} g_{n/2,\phi}(\phi) X^{n/2+1} \right] , \\ B_4 &= G_4 + \frac{1}{2(n+1)} g_{n/2,\phi}(\phi) X^{n/2+1} , \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where G_4 ($\neq 0$) and $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ are constants. The deviation from Horndeski theories ($\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$) arises from the Lagrangian L_4. For the theories with $n > 2$, the term $X^{(n+1)/2}$ in Eqs. (4.7) and (4.8) has the power-law index larger than 3/2. On using the fact that the field $\phi(r)$ can be expanded as Eq. (3.4) around $r = 0$, the five coefficients $\mathcal{D}_{1,2,3,4,5}$ for $n > 2$ vanish as $r \to 0$. Hence the conical singularity induced by the non-zero constant $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ term is not affected by the terms with $n > 2$ in G_5. This includes the case of the Lagrangian L_5 for covariant Galileons ($n = 4$).

For the power $n = 2$, it follows that the coefficients $\mathcal{D}_{1,2,4,5}$ vanish as $r \to 0$, whereas $\mathcal{D}_3$ behaves as

$$\mathcal{D}_3 \to 16 e^{-4\Phi_0} \left(1 - 3 e^{-2\Phi_0} \right) \phi_2^3 \, g_1(\phi_0) . \tag{4.10}$$

This term simply works as an additional constant to A_2 in Eq. (2.17), so the conical singularity is not affected by the term $g_1(\phi)X$ in Eq. (4.1).

For $n = 1$, the coefficient $\mathcal{D}_4$ vanishes as $r \to 0$, while the other coefficients behave as

$$\mathcal{D}_1 \to -8e^{-5\Phi_0}\phi_2^2\, g_{1/2}(\phi_0)\,, \qquad \mathcal{D}_2 \to 4e^{-3\Phi_0}\left(1-2e^{-2\Phi_0}\right)\phi_2^2\, g_{1/2}(\phi_0)\,,$$
$$\mathcal{D}_3 \to \frac{4}{r}e^{-3\Phi_0}\left(1-2e^{-2\Phi_0}\right)\phi_2^2\, g_{1/2}(\phi_0)\,, \qquad \mathcal{D}_5 \to -8e^{-5\Phi_0}\phi_2^2\, g_{1/2}(\phi_0)\,. \tag{4.11}$$

In this case, we expand Φ, Ψ, ϕ as Eqs. (3.2)-(3.4) and substitute the functions (4.7)-(4.9) and their derivatives into Eqs. (2.17)-(2.19) to derive the solutions around $r = 0$ iteratively. In doing so, we consider the terms like $g_{n/2}(\phi)$, $g_{n/2,\phi}(\phi)$, and $g_{n/2,\phi\phi}(\phi)$ as constants. Then, we obtain the same solutions as those derived in Eqs. (3.6)-(3.8). Since the field $\phi(r)$ stays constant, we have $\phi_2 = 0$ and hence all the coefficients of Eq. (4.11) vanish. Note that the solutions for $n \geq 2$ are also given by Eqs. (3.6)-(3.8).

The above discussion shows that, for $F_5 = 0$, the conical singularity arising from the non-zero $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ is not affected by the Lagrangian L_5 containing the function G_5 in the form (4.1).

4.2 $F_5 \neq 0$

Let us proceed to the case in which F_5 does not vanish (i.e., outside the Horndeski domain) with G_5 given by Eq. (4.1). Then, the functions A_5, B_5, A_4, B_4 are of the forms (4.3)-(4.6), where G_4 ($\neq 0$) and $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ are assumed to be constant. We also consider the massless scalar field with $A_2 = -X/2$ and $A_3 = 0$.

As long as A_5 does not contain negative powers of X^m, the action (2.1) remains finite. In addition to the positive powers originating from the sum on the r.h.s. of Eq. (4.3), we can also take into account the terms $a_0(\phi)$ and $a_1(\phi)X^{1/2}$ from the new contribution $-X^{5/2}F_5$, where $a_0(\phi)$ and $a_1(\phi)$ are functions of ϕ. In this case, we have

$$A_5 = a_0(\phi) + a_1(\phi)X^{1/2} - \sum_{n=1}\frac{n}{6}g_{n/2}(\phi)X^{(n+1)/2}\,. \tag{4.12}$$

This expression can be regarded as the expansion of the regular function A_5 with respect to r around the center of the compact body.

Now, we derive the solutions to Eqs. (2.17)-(2.19) under the expansions (3.2)-(3.4) around $r = 0$. After differentiating the functions (4.3)-(4.6) with respect to ϕ, we deal with the terms such as $a_{0,\phi}$ and $a_{1,\phi}$ as constants. Up to linear order in r, the gravitational potentials are given by

$$\Phi(r) = \Phi_0 + \frac{1}{6}\frac{(1+\alpha_{\rm H4}-e^{-2\Phi_0})e^{3\Phi_0}G_4}{a_0(1+\alpha_{\rm H4})}r + \mathcal{O}(r^2)\,, \tag{4.13}$$
$$\Psi(r) = \Psi_0 - \frac{1}{6}\frac{(1+\alpha_{\rm H4}-e^{-2\Phi_0})e^{3\Phi_0}G_4}{a_0(1+\alpha_{\rm H4})}r + \mathcal{O}(r^2)\,, \tag{4.14}$$

and $\phi_2 = 0$. These solutions arise from the existence of the non-vanishing term a_0 in the limit $X \to 0$. The terms containing ρ_m appear at cubic order in r. We recall that the curvature quantities are finite under the three conditions (3.15), (3.16), and (3.17). Demanding the first condition ($\Phi_0 = 0$) as the usual boundary condition in GR, the coefficients of the linear term in r read[1]

$$\Phi_1 = -\Psi_1 = \frac{\alpha_{\rm H4}}{6a_0(1+\alpha_{\rm H4})}G_4\,. \tag{4.15}$$

[1]It also follows that $\phi_i = 0$ ($i \geq 3$), so the field $\phi(r)$ is constant.

For the theories with $\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$, neither Eq. (3.16) nor Eq. (3.17) are satisfied, so the divergence of curvature quantities still persists even in the presence of the F_5 term. If $\alpha_{\rm H4} = 0$, then we have $\Phi_1 = \Psi_1 = 0$ and hence there is no divergent behavior of curvature invariants.

Equations (4.13) and (4.14) look divergent in the limit that $a_0 \to 0$, but for the theories with $a_0 = 0$ the solutions to gravitational potentials are different from those for $a_0 \neq 0$. When $a_0 = 0$ the dominant contributions to the coefficients of Φ' and Ψ' in Eqs. (2.17)-(2.18) correspond to the term $4e^{-2\Phi}A_4/r$ around the origin. On the other hand, when $a_0 \neq 0$, the term $12e^{-3\Phi}A_5/r^2$, which comes from $\mathcal{D}_2$, dominates over the contribution $4e^{-2\Phi}A_4/r$ in the limit $r \to 0$. In the latter case, the $1/r^2$ dependent term mentioned above gives rise to the unusual solutions (4.13) and (4.14) with an arbitrary value of Φ_0. In other words, there is no continuous limit between the solutions for $a_0 = 0$ and $a_0 \neq 0$. When $a_0 = 0$, the leading-order contribution to Φ is given by $\Phi_0 = -(1/2)\ln(1+\alpha_{\rm H_4})$ without the divergences of Φ and Ψ. Hence, for $\alpha_{\rm H_4} \neq 0$, the conical singularity is present in this case as well.

The above discussion shows that the additional term F_5 to the Lagrangian L_5 provides the new contributions $a_0(\phi)$ and $a_1(\phi)X^{1/2}$ to A_5, but such terms themselves do not generate new types of singularities at the origin. The conical singularity intrinsically arises for the models in which the parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ approaches a non-zero constant as $r \to 0$. The existence of the function F_5 beyond the Horndeski domain does not help to eliminate the curvature singularity induced by the Lagrangian L_4 with $\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$. Since the functional forms (4.12) and (4.4) can be regarded as the expansions of regular functions A_5 and B_5 with positive powers of X^m, our results are valid for general models in which the action (2.1) is finite for $X \to 0$.

5 Solutions inside/outside the compact body and the screening mechanism

In this section we obtain the field profile around the spherical symmetric body under the approximation of weak gravity ($|\Phi| \ll 1$, $|\Psi| \ll 1$). We take into account the non-minimal coupling $G_4(\phi)R$ to study whether the screening of the fifth force between the field ϕ and matter can be at work in the presence of the Lagrangian L_5 with $F_5 \neq 0$. We also study the matching of solutions inside and outside the body to place constraints on the magnitude of the Lagrangian L_5 for the consistency with local gravity experiments.

In GR ($-A_4 = B_4 = M_{\rm pl}^2/2$), the terms $4e^{-2\Phi}A_4\Phi'/r$ and $4e^{-2\Phi}A_4\Psi'/r$, which are of the order of $4A_4\Phi/r^2$, are the dominant contributions to Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18), respectively. We divide Eqs. (2.17)-(2.18) with respect to $4A_4/r^2$ and consider each of the terms as small parameters at most of the order Φ. This is required to recover the behavior close to GR in the solar system [47, 50]. We also assume that the parameters $|\alpha_{\rm H4}|$ and $|\alpha_{\rm t4}|$ are much smaller than unity and that the pressure P_m of non-relativistic matter is of the same order as $\rho_m\Psi$.

Taking the r derivative of Eq. (2.18) and combining it with Eq. (2.20), we can eliminate the P_m' term to obtain the second-order equation for Ψ. Eliminating the second derivative Ψ'' by using Eq. (2.19) with Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18), we can derive the second-order equation for ϕ. Under this scheme of approximations, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\left(r^2\phi'\right)' \simeq \mu_1\rho_m + \mu_2\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\mu_1 = -\frac{\phi' r}{4A_4\beta}\left(A_{3,X}+\beta+\frac{6A_{5,X}+B_{5,X}}{r^2}\right), \tag{5.2}$$

$$\mu_2 = \frac{1}{\beta r}\left[\left(\frac{A_{2,\phi}}{2}-XA_{2,\phi X}\right)r^2+(A_{3,\phi}-2XA_{3,\phi X}+4\phi' XA_{2,XX})r \right.$$
$$\left. +2\phi'(A_{3,X}+4XA_{3,XX})-2A_{4,\phi}+2XA_{4,\phi X}-\frac{8\phi' XA_{4,XX}+r\alpha_1-4\phi'\alpha_2}{r}\right]. \tag{5.3}$$

The parameters β, α_1, α_2 are given by

$$\beta \equiv (A_{2,X}+2XA_{2,XX})r+2(A_{3,X}+2XA_{3,XX})-\frac{4XA_{4,XX}}{r}+\frac{2\alpha_2}{r}, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\alpha_1 \equiv 2XB_{4,\phi X}-B_{4,\phi}-A_{4,\phi}, \tag{5.5}$$

$$\alpha_2 \equiv 2XB_{4,XX}+B_{4,X}-A_{4,X}. \tag{5.6}$$

From Eqs. (2.17) and (2.18) it follows that

$$(r\Phi)' \simeq -\frac{\rho_m r^2}{4A_4}+\frac{r^2}{4A_4}\left[A_2-\phi'\left(A_{3,\phi}+2\phi'' A_{3,X}\right)+\frac{4\phi'}{r}\left(A_{4,\phi}+2\phi'' A_{4,X}\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+\frac{\phi'}{r^2}\left\{2\phi''\left(6A_{5,X}+B_{5,X}\right)+6A_{5,\phi}+B_{5,\phi}\right\}\right]-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{\rm t4}, \tag{5.7}$$

$$\Psi' \simeq \frac{\Phi}{r}-\frac{r}{4A_4}\left(A_2-2\phi'^2 A_{2,X}\right)+\frac{\phi'^2 A_{3,X}}{A_4}-\frac{\phi'^2 A_{4,X}}{A_4 r}+\frac{\alpha_{\rm H4}}{2r}. \tag{5.8}$$

In Eq. (5.1) the effect of the Lagrangian L_5 arises only for the term $\mu_1\rho_m$, which leads to an additional interaction between the scalar field and matter. For the theories in which the condition

$$6A_{5,X}+B_{5,X}=0 \tag{5.9}$$

is satisfied, Eq. (5.1) is of the same form as the one without L_5. If A_5 and B_5 depend on X alone, it follows that the term $(6A_{5,\phi}+B_{5,\phi})\phi'/r^2$ in Eq. (5.7) vanishes and that the G_5-dependent terms do not contribute to A_4 and B_4. This means that, for $A_5(X)$ and $B_5(X)$ satisfying the condition (5.9), the resulting profiles of ϕ, Φ, Ψ are the same as those for the case $L_5 = 0$.

In Horndeski theories the relation $A_5 = -XB_{5,X}/3$ holds, so the condition (5.9) can be satisfied only for the specific functions $A_5 = cX^{1/2}$ and $B_5 = -6cX^{1/2}$ (c is a constant). However, for the regular function G_5 given by Eq. (4.1), we have A_5 and B_5 in the forms (4.3) and (4.4) with $F_5 = 0$, so the above specific case is not encompassed. Hence we need to go beyond the Horndeski domain to fulfill the condition (5.9).

5.1 Concrete model

In the framework of GLPV theories, we consider a massless scalar field ϕ coupled to the Ricci scalar R with $F(\phi)R$. We study how non-linear field self-interactions like $f_4(X)$ in G_4 and $f_5(X)$ in G_5 affect the field profile inside/outside the body. We also take into account the "beyond-Horndeski" terms $F_4 = g_4(X)$ and $F_5 = g_5(X)$. Namely, we study the theories

given by

$$G_2 = -\frac{1}{2}X\,, \qquad G_3 = 0\,, \qquad G_4 = \frac{1}{2}M_{\rm pl}^2 F(\phi) + f_4(X)\,, \qquad G_5 = f_5(X)\,,$$
$$F_4 = g_4(X)\,, \qquad F_5 = g_5(X)\,. \tag{5.10}$$

On using the correspondence (2.7)-(2.12) with $X > 0$, these functions translate to

$$A_2 = -\frac{1}{2}X\,, \qquad A_3 = M_{\rm pl}^2\sqrt{X}F_{,\phi}\,, \qquad A_4 = -\frac{1}{2}M_{\rm pl}^2 F - f_4 + 2Xf_{4,X} - X^2 g_4\,,$$
$$B_4 = \frac{1}{2}M_{\rm pl}^2 F + f_4\,, \qquad A_5 = -X^{3/2}\left(Xg_5 + \frac{1}{3}f_{5,X}\right)\,, \qquad B_5 = \int \sqrt{X} f_{5,X} dX\,. \tag{5.11}$$

For concreteness, we focus on the following functions

$$F = e^{-2q\phi/M_{\rm pl}}\,, \qquad f_4 = \frac{c_4}{M^6}X^2\,, \qquad f_5 = \frac{c_5}{M^9}X^2\,, \qquad g_4 = \frac{d_4}{M^6}\,, \qquad g_5 = \frac{d_5}{M^9}\,, \tag{5.12}$$

where M is a constant having a dimension of mass, and q, c_4, c_5, d_4, d_5 are dimensionless constants whose magnitudes are at most of the order of 1. The parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ is given by

$$\alpha_{\rm H4} = -\frac{2d_4X^2}{M^6M_{\rm pl}^2F - 2(3c_4 - d_4)X^2}\,, \tag{5.13}$$

which vanishes as $r \to 0$ for the boundary condition $\phi'(0) = 0$. Hence there is no conical singularity at $r = 0$ induced by $\alpha_{\rm H4}$. The functions A_5 and B_5 read

$$A_5 = -\frac{2c_5 + 3d_5}{3M^9}X^{5/2}\,, \qquad B_5 = \frac{4c_5}{5M^9}X^{5/2}\,, \tag{5.14}$$

which obey the relation $A_5 + XB_{5,X}/3 = -d_5M^9X^{5/2}$. The functions (5.14) correspond to $n = 2$ and $F_5 =$ constant in Eqs. (4.3)-(4.4), so no additional curvature singularity is induced by the Lagrangian L_5.

We fix the mass scale M to be

$$M^3 = M_{\rm pl}H_0^2\,, \tag{5.15}$$

where H_0 is the today's Hubble parameter whose inverse is of the order of $H_0^{-1} \simeq 10^{28}$ cm. The choice (5.15) is associated with the fact that we are interested in the case where the field ϕ is responsible for the present cosmic acceleration like the covariant Galileon model [10, 56]. The Galileon cosmology studied in Ref. [56] is based on the minimal coupling model ($F(\phi) = 1$) with $g_4 = 0 = g_5$, in which case there is a tracker that finally approaches a de Sitter attractor characterized by $X =$ constant. The model (5.10) is the extension of covariant Galileons to the case in which there are two more functions g_4 and g_5. The coupling between the field ϕ and gravity is characterized by the non-zero constant q. The field is indirectly coupled to matter through its gravitational interaction.

For the above theories, the field equation of motion is given by Eq. (5.1) with

$$\mu_1 = -\frac{1}{2\beta r}\frac{(qM_{\rm pl}F - \beta\phi')r^2 + (8c_5 + 15d_5)\phi'^4/M^9}{M_{\rm pl}^2F - 2(3c_4 - d_4)\phi'^4/M^6}\,, \tag{5.16}$$

$$\mu_2 = -\frac{24(2c_4 - d_4)}{\beta}\frac{\phi'^3}{M^6r^2}\,, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\beta = -\frac{r}{2}\left[1 + \frac{24(2c_4 - d_4)\phi'^2}{M^6r^2}\right]\,. \tag{5.18}$$

We derive the solution to Eq. (5.1) around a compact body with the r-dependent density $\rho_m(r)$. For concreteness, let us consider the density distribution

$$\rho_m(r) = \rho_c\, e^{-r^2/r_t^2}\,, \tag{5.19}$$

where ρ_c is the central density. The density starts to vary significantly at the transition radius r_t, which is of the same order as the radius r_s of the body. We can also consider other density profiles which decrease for larger r, but the qualitative behavior of solutions is similar to that discussed below.

To derive the field profile analytically as well as numerically, it is convenient to introduce the following dimensionless quantities

$$\begin{aligned} &x = \frac{r}{r_s}\,, \qquad y = \frac{M_{\rm pl}\phi'^3(r)}{M^6\rho_c r_s^3}\,, \qquad z = \frac{\phi}{M_{\rm pl}}\,, \\ &\lambda_1 = \left(\frac{\rho_c r_s^2}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\right)^{1/3}\,, \qquad \lambda_2 = \left(\frac{M^3 r_s^2}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3}\,, \qquad \xi_t = \frac{r_t}{r_s}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Then, Eq. (5.1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dy}{dx} =& -\frac{6}{x}y + \frac{144 s_4\lambda_1^2 y^{5/3}}{x(\lambda_2^2 x^2 + 24 s_4\lambda_1^2 y^{2/3})} \\ &+\frac{3}{2}\frac{\lambda_2(2qFx^2 + \lambda_1\lambda_2^2 x^3 y^{1/3} + 24\lambda_1^3 s_4 xy) + 2s_5\lambda_1^4 y^{4/3}}{\lambda_2(\lambda_2^2 x^2 + 24 s_4\lambda_1^2 y^{2/3})[F - 2\lambda_1^4\lambda_2^2(3c_4 - d_4)y^{4/3}]}\lambda_1^2\, e^{-x^2/\xi_t^2}\, y^{2/3}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

where

$$s_4 \equiv 2c_4 - d_4\,, \qquad s_5 \equiv 8c_5 + 15d_5\,. \tag{5.22}$$

We remind the reader that $d_5 = 0$ corresponds to the case $F_5 = 0$ (one of the two conditions Horndeski theories satisfy), whereas $s_5 = 0$ implies the case in which L_5 does not affect the dominant term in the scalar-field equation (5.1). The quantity z obeys the differential equation

$$\frac{dz}{dx} = \lambda_1\lambda_2^2\, y^{1/3}\,. \tag{5.23}$$

Since $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 = (M_{\rm pl}^2 H_0^2/\rho_c)^{1/3} \simeq (\rho_0/\rho_c)^{1/3}$, where $\rho_0 = 10^{-29}$ g/cm^3 is the today's cosmological density, λ_2 is much smaller than λ_1 for compact bodies like the Sun or the Earth. For the Sun ($\rho_c \simeq 100$ g/cm^3 and $r_s \simeq 7\times 10^{10}$ cm), we have that $\lambda_1 \simeq 0.1$ and $\lambda_2 \simeq 10^{-12}$. If we consider the distance $x = r/r_s$ for which the condition

$$\lambda_2^2 x^2 \ll |24 s_4\lambda_1^2 y^{2/3}| \tag{5.24}$$

is satisfied, the first two terms on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.21) cancel each other. In this regime only the density-dependent term survives, so that Eq. (5.21) is simplified to

$$\frac{dy}{dx} \simeq \frac{\lambda_2(2qFx^2 + \lambda_1\lambda_2^2 x^3 y^{1/3} + 24\lambda_1^3 s_4 xy) + 2s_5\lambda_1^4 y^{4/3}}{16 s_4\lambda_2[F - 2\lambda_1^4\lambda_2^2(3c_4 - d_4)y^{4/3}]}e^{-x^2/\xi_t^2}\,. \tag{5.25}$$

The distance at which the condition (5.24) starts to be violated corresponds to the Vainshtein radius r_V. This radius can be derived after obtaining the solution to Eq. (5.25). Provided the Vainshtein mechanism is at work, the variation of $z = \phi/M_{\rm pl}$ is tiny, such that the quantity

$F = e^{-2qz}$ stays nearly constant. We shall consider the boundary condition of $z(r=0)$ where F is close to 1.

The condition (5.9) translates to $8c_5 + 15d_5 = 0$, under which the contributions from L_5 to Eqs. (5.1) and (5.7) vanish. In Sec. 5.2 we first discuss the solution to the field in this case and proceed to the theories with $d_5 \neq -8c_5/15$ in Sec. 5.3.

Before deriving the field solution for each case, we provide the general argument about the behavior of gravitational potentials for the model given by the functions (5.11). Suppose that the solution to the field ϕ around the compact body is expressed in the form

$$\phi'(r) = m^2 \left(\frac{r}{r_s}\right)^p , \tag{5.26}$$

where m corresponds to some mass scale and p (≥ 0) is a constant. Then, we can integrate Eqs. (5.7)-(5.8) to obtain Φ and Ψ. In doing so, we define the Schwarzschild radius of the source, as

$$r_g = \frac{1}{M_{\rm pl}^2} \int_0^r \rho_m(\tilde{r})\tilde{r}^2 d\tilde{r} \, . \tag{5.27}$$

For $p > 0$, substitution of Eq. (5.26) into Eqs. (5.7)-(5.8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(r) \simeq \frac{r_g}{2r}\Bigg[1 - 2q\frac{(mr)^2}{M_{\rm pl} r_g}x^p + \frac{(1+8q^2)m^4 r^3}{2(2p+3)M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{2p} \\ - \frac{2\{4c_4(1+6p) - d_4(1+8p)\}m^8 r}{(4p+1)M^6 M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{4p} + \frac{2s_5 m^{10}}{5M^9 M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{5p}\Bigg] , \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(r) \simeq -\frac{r_g}{2r}\Bigg[1 - 2q\frac{(mr)^2}{(1+p)M_{\rm pl} r_g}x^p - \frac{(2+p+4q^2)m^4 r^3}{2(3+5p+2p^2)M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{2p} \\ - \frac{2s_4(3p+1)m^8 r}{p(4p+1)M^6 M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{4p} - \frac{2s_5 m^{10}}{5(5p-1)M^9 M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}x^{5p}\Bigg] , \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where the integration constant arising in Eq. (5.28) has been absorbed into r_g, and another integration constant arising in Eq. (5.29) has been set to 0 to satisfy the boundary condition $\Psi(r \to \infty) = 0$. We have also neglected the term $(3c_4 - d_4)X^2/M^6$ in A_4, which gives rise to the contributions to Φ and Ψ of the orders of $(3c_4 - d_4)m^8 x^{4p}/(M^6 M_{\rm pl}^2) r_g/r$ (which are smaller than the fourth terms in Eqs. (5.28) and (5.29) for $r > r_g$).

For $p = 0$, the solutions to Φ and Ψ are given by

$$\Phi(r) \simeq \frac{r_g}{2r}\left[1 - 2q\frac{(mr)^2}{M_{\rm pl} r_g} + \frac{(1+8q^2)m^4 r^3}{6M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g} - \frac{2(4c_4 - d_4)m^8 r}{M^6 M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g}\right] , \tag{5.30}$$

$$\Psi(r) \simeq -\frac{r_g}{2r}\left[1 - 2q\frac{(mr)^2}{M_{\rm pl} r_g} - \frac{(1+2q^2)m^4 r^3}{3M_{\rm pl}^2 r_g} - \frac{8(2c_4 - d_4)m^8}{M^6 M_{\rm pl}^2}\frac{r}{r_g}\ln\frac{r}{r_*}\right] , \tag{5.31}$$

where r_* is an integration constant. Since the ϕ'' term in Eq. (5.7) vanishes in this case, the Lagrangian L_5 does not affect the gravitational potentials for the constant ϕ' solution.

For the consistency with local gravity experiments, the post Newtonian parameter $\gamma = -\Phi/\Psi$ is constrained to be [57]

$$|\gamma - 1| < 2.3 \times 10^{-5} \tag{5.32}$$

inside the solar system.

5.2 Model with $s_5 = 0$

Let us first study the field profile and the gravitational potentials for the model with $s_5 = 0$, i.e., $8c_5 + 15d_5 = 0$. In this case, the L_5-dependent term vanishes from the field equation. Around the compact body (including both interior and exterior), we employ the approximations that $F \gg |2\lambda_1^4\lambda_2^2(3c_4 - d_4)y^{4/3}|$ and that the second term in the numerator of Eq. (5.25) is sub-dominant relative to the first term. The consistency of these approximations can be checked after deriving the solution. Then, Eq. (5.25) is further simplified to

$$\frac{dy}{dx} \simeq \frac{1}{8s_4F}\left(qFx^2 + 12\lambda_1^3 s_4 xy\right) e^{-x^2/\xi_t^2}\,. \tag{5.33}$$

Under the boundary condition $\phi'(0) = 0$, the solution to Eq. (5.25) around $r = 0$ (at which $e^{-x^2/\xi_t^2} \simeq 1$) is given by $y(x) = qx^3/(24s_4)$, i.e.,

$$\phi'(r) = \left(\frac{q\rho_c M^6}{24 s_4 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3} r\,, \qquad (0 < r \ll r_s). \tag{5.34}$$

On using the solution (5.34), we find that the second term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.33) is smaller than the first one for the distance

$$r < r_s\sqrt{\frac{2F}{\lambda_1^3}} \equiv r_1\,. \tag{5.35}$$

For $\lambda_1 \lesssim O(1)$, which includes the case of the Sun, r_1 is larger than r_s. Around the surface of the body, however, the exponential term e^{-x^2/ξ_t^2} starts to suppress the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.33). Employing the approximation that the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.33) vanishes in the regime $r > r_s$, we obtain $\phi'(r) =$ constant. Matching this with Eq. (5.34) at $r = r_s$, the solution for $r > r_s$ is given by

$$\phi'(r) = \left(\frac{q\rho_c M^6}{24 s_4 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3} r_s\,, \qquad (r_s < r < r_V). \tag{5.36}$$

The solution (5.36) is valid up to the radius r_V at which the condition (5.24) starts to be violated. This radius can be estimated as

$$r_V = (24|s_4|)^{1/6}\left(\frac{|q|\rho_c}{M^3 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3} r_s\,. \tag{5.37}$$

In the regime $r > r_V$, the first term $-6y/x$ on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.21) dominates over the other terms, so we obtain the solution $\phi'(r) \propto 1/r^2$. Matching this with Eq. (5.36), the resulting solution for $r > r_V$ is given by

$$\phi'(r) = \left(\frac{q\rho_c M^6}{24 s_4 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3} \frac{r_s r_V^2}{r^2}\,, \qquad (r > r_V). \tag{5.38}$$

The Schwarzschild radius for the density profile (5.19), in the limit $r \to \infty$, reads

$$r_g = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4}\frac{\rho_c r_t^3}{M_{\rm pl}^2} \approx \frac{\rho_c r_s^3}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\,, \tag{5.39}$$

where we used the approximation $r_t \approx r_s$. Then, the solutions (5.36) and (5.38) can be expressed in the forms $\phi'(r) \approx qM_{\rm pl}r_g/r_V^2$ and $\phi'(r) \approx qM_{\rm pl}r_g/r^2$, respectively, with $r_V \approx |s_4|^{1/6}(|q|M_{\rm pl}r_g)^{1/3}/M$. These solutions coincide with those for the theories with $L_5 = 0$ [32].

In Fig. 1 we plot an example of the field profile for $c_5 = 1$ and $d_5 = -8/15$ (i.e., $s_5 = 0$) as the case (a) with the model parameters $c_4 = 1$, $d_4 = 1$, $q = 1$, $\lambda_1 = 0.1$, $\lambda_2 = 3.0 \times 10^{-12}$, $\xi_t = 0.5$ (the density profile of the Sun is modeled). This profile is derived by numerically integrating Eqs. (5.21) and (5.23) with the boundary conditions $y(r) = 10^{-40} \approx 0$ and $z(r) = 0$ at $r/r_s = e^{-15} \approx 0$. The behavior of the solutions does not strongly depend on the choice of the boundary conditions. As estimated by Eqs. (5.34), (5.36), and (5.38), the field derivative $\phi'(r)$ linearly grows for $0 < r \lesssim r_s$, stays with a constant value for $r_s \lesssim r < r_V$, and then decreases as $\propto 1/r^2$ for $r > r_V$. For the Sun ($r_s = 7 \times 10^{10}$ cm) with $|s_4| = O(1)$, the Vainshtein radius can be estimated as $r_V \simeq 3 \times 10^{20}$ cm.

For the exterior solution (5.36), the mass scale m in Eq. (5.26) reads

$$m^2 = \left(\frac{q\rho_c M^6}{24 s_4 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3} r_s \approx \frac{qM_{\rm pl}r_g}{r_V^2}\,, \tag{5.40}$$

with the power $p = 0$. Substituting Eq. (5.40) into Eqs. (5.30)-(5.31), we obtain the gravitational potentials in the regime $r_s < r < r_V$. For the Sun ($r_g \simeq 3 \times 10^5$ cm) with $|q|, |c_4|, |d_4|$ of the order of unity, the second, third, fourth terms on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (5.30) and (5.31) do not exceed the orders of 10^{-13}, 10^{-34}, and 10^{-20}, respectively, inside the solar system ($r \lesssim 10^{14}$ cm). Hence the solar-system constraint (5.32) is satisfied for the field solution in the regime $r_s < r < r_V$.

The interior solution (5.34) corresponds to the mass m same as Eq. (5.40) with $p = 1$, in which case the gravitational potentials are given by Eqs. (5.28)-(5.29) with $s_5 = 0$. The second, third, fourth terms on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (5.28) and (5.29) are at most of the orders of 10^{-19}, 10^{-44}, and 10^{-24}, respectively, around the surface of the Sun, so the bound (5.32) is well satisfied.

5.3 Model with $s_5 \neq 0$

Let us proceed to the discussion of solutions for non-zero values of s_5. In high-density regions with the distance satisfying the condition (5.24), we can employ the same approximations as those used for the derivation of Eq. (5.33). For the model with $s_5 \neq 0$, Eq. (5.33) is modified to

$$\frac{dy}{dx} \simeq \frac{1}{8\lambda_2 s_4 F}\left(qF\lambda_2 x^2 + 12\lambda_1^3\lambda_2 s_4 xy + \lambda_1^4 s_5 y^{4/3}\right) e^{-x^2/\xi_t^2}\,. \tag{5.41}$$

Around the center of the body ($0 < r \ll r_s$) the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.41) is the dominant contribution, so we obtain the same solution as Eq. (5.34), i.e.,

$$y(x) = \frac{q}{24 s_4} x^3\,. \tag{5.42}$$

We recall that the second term is sub-dominant to the first one under the condition (5.35). The third term is smaller than the first one for the distance

$$r < \sqrt{\frac{F\lambda_2}{|s_5|\lambda_1^4}}\frac{(24|s_4|)^{2/3}}{|q|^{1/6}} r_s \equiv r_2\,. \tag{5.43}$$

Unless $|s_5|$ is much less than unity, we have that $r_2 \ll \{r_s, r_1\}$ for $\lambda_2 \ll 1$ and for $\lambda_1, |s_4|, |q|$ of the order of unity. Then, the L_5-dependent contribution begins to be important for the




Figure 1. The field profile $y^{1/3} = [M_{\rm pl}/(M^6\rho_c r_s^3)]^{1/3}\phi'(r)$ versus r/r_s for $q = 1$, $\lambda_1 = 0.1$, $\lambda_2 = 3.0 \times 10^{-12}$, $\xi_t = 0.5$, $c_4 = 1$, and $d_4 = 1$. Each case corresponds to (a) $c_5 = 1$, $d_5 = -8/15$, (b) $c_5 = 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$, $d_5 = 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$, (c) $c_5 = 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$, $d_5 = 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$, (d) $c_5 = -1.0$, $d_5 = -1.0$. We have chosen initial conditions $y = 10^{-40}$ and $z = 0$ at $r/r_s = e^{-15}$. The Vainshtein mechanism is most effective for the case (d).

distance r_2 much smaller than r_1. In what follows, we shall discuss the two cases (a) $s_5 > 0$ and (b) $s_5 < 0$ separately, for positive values of q and s_4.

5.3.1 $s_5 > 0$

If $s_5 > 0$, then the third term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.41) dominates over the first one for the distance $r > r_2$. Picking up this dominant contribution alone, we obtain the following integrated solution

$$y(x)^{-1/3} + \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\lambda_1^4 s_5}{48\lambda_2 s_4 F}\,\xi_t\,{\rm erf}\left(\frac{x}{\xi_t}\right) = C\,, \tag{5.44}$$

where ${\rm erf}(x) = (2/\sqrt{\pi})\int_0^x e^{-s^2}ds$ is the error function and C is an integration constant. Since the solution (5.42) is valid up to the dimensionless distance $x_2 \equiv r_2/r_s$, we can match it with Eq. (5.44) at $x = x_2$. Then, the solution for the distance $r > r_2$ (but for r smaller than the Vainshtein radius r_V derived later) is given by

$$y(x) = \left[\left(\frac{24 s_4}{q x_2^3}\right)^{1/3} + \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\lambda_1^4 s_5}{48\lambda_2 s_4 F}\xi_t\left\{{\rm erf}\left(\frac{x_2}{\xi_t}\right) - {\rm erf}\left(\frac{x}{\xi_t}\right)\right\}\right]^{-3}. \tag{5.45}$$

Provided that $r_2 \ll r_t$, the term $\xi_t\,{\rm erf}(x_2/\xi_t)$ is close to 0. The function $y(x)$ increases for larger x with the growth of the error function ${\rm erf}(x/\xi_t)$ toward 1.

If the condition

$$s_5 < \left(\frac{24s_4}{qx_2^3}\right)^{1/3} \frac{48\lambda_2 s_4 F}{\sqrt{\pi}\lambda_1^4 \xi_t} \tag{5.46}$$

is satisfied, then $y(x)$ approaches the value

$$y(x) \to \left[\left(\frac{24s_4}{qx_2^3}\right)^{1/3} - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\lambda_1^4 \xi_t s_5}{48\lambda_2 s_4 F}\right]^{-3}, \tag{5.47}$$

where we used the approximation $\xi_t \mathrm{erf}(x_2/\xi_t) \simeq 0$. On using Eq. (5.43), one can eliminate x_2 in Eq. (5.46). Then, the condition (5.46) translates to

$$s_5 < s_5^{\rm max} \equiv \frac{192}{\pi}\left(\frac{3s_4^4}{q}\right)^{1/3} \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^4}\frac{F}{\xi_t^2}\,. \tag{5.48}$$

From Eq. (5.47) it follows that the positive value of s_5 leads to the enhancement of $\phi'(r)$. The case (b) shown in Fig. 1 corresponds to such an example, in which case the transition to the solution (5.47) occurs around $r_2 \approx r_s$. We caution that the solution (5.47) is valid for the distance r satisfying the condition (5.24), i.e.,

$$r < r_V \equiv (24s_4)^{1/6}\left(\frac{q\rho_c}{M^3 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3}\left(1 - \frac{s_5}{s_5^{\rm max}}\right)^{-1} r_2\,. \tag{5.49}$$

Compared to the Vainshtein radius (5.37) derived for $s_5 = 0$, the existence of the factor $(1 - s_5/s_5^{\rm max})^{-1}$ in Eq. (5.49) works to increase r_V for $s_5 > 0$. In fact, this property can be seen by comparing the cases (a) and (b) in Fig. 1. Outside the Vainshtein radius the s_5-dependent term in Eq. (5.21) is suppressed, so integration of the equation $dy/dx \simeq -6y/x$ gives the solution $y(x) \propto 1/x^6$. Matching this with Eq. (5.47), we obtain the solution for $r > r_V$:

$$y(x) = \frac{qx_2^3}{24s_4}\left(1 - \frac{s_5}{s_5^{\rm max}}\right)^{-3}\left(\frac{r_V}{r_s}\right)^6 \frac{1}{x^6}\,. \tag{5.50}$$

In summary, provided the parameter s_5 is in the range (5.48), the solution to $y(x)$ is given by Eq. (5.42) for $0 < r < r_2$, Eq. (5.45) for $r_2 < r < r_V$, and Eq. (5.50) for $r > r_V$.

Unless s_5 is very close to $s_5^{\rm max}$, the order of $\phi'(r)$ is not very much different from that for $s_5 = 0$, see the cases (a) and (b) in Fig. 1. Hence the screening of the fifth force in the regime $r_s < r < r_V$ works in a similar way to that discussed in Sec. 5.2. Provided that $y(x)$ given by Eq. (5.47) is not much different from the value $qx_2^3/(24s_2)$, the solar-system constraint (5.32) is satisfied for $r_s < r < r_V$.

For the distance $r < r_s$ the variation of $\phi'(r)$ occurs, so the Lagrangian L_5 gives rise to non-vanishing contributions to the gravitational potentials. In the case of the Sun, the last terms of Eqs. (5.28) and (5.29) are at most of the order of $10^{-15}s_5$. Meanwhile, the condition (5.48) translates to $s_5 \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-6}\, s_4^{4/3} F/(q^{1/3}\xi_t^2)$. For s_4, q, ξ_t of the order of unity, the corrections to Φ and Ψ induced by the non-zero s_5 term are smaller than 10^{-21}.

If the condition (5.48) is violated, the field derivative exhibits the divergence at the distance $r_{\rm D}$ satisfying

$$\mathrm{erf}\left(\frac{r_{\rm D}}{r_t}\right) = \frac{s_5^{\rm max}}{s_5}\,. \tag{5.51}$$

In this case, the screening mechanism is disrupted by the presence of the Lagrangian L_5. In the case (c) of Fig. 1, the field derivative goes to infinity at the distance $r_{\rm D}$ smaller than r_s. For larger s_5, $r_{\rm D}$ gets smaller. To avoid the divergent behavior of $\phi'(r)$, we require that the parameter s_5 is in the range (5.48). In the numerical simulation of Fig. 1 we have chosen the values $s_4 = 1$, $q = 1$, and $\xi_t = 0.5$, so the condition (5.48) translates to $s_5 < \mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ for the Sun.

5.3.2 $s_5 < 0$

Let us proceed to the discussion for the case $s_5 < 0$. The third term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.41), which is negative, tends to catch up with the first one around the distance $r = r_2$, but the solution is saturated around the point $dy/dx = 0$. In the regime $r_2 < r < r_t \approx r_s$ at which the factor e^{-x^2/ξ_t^2} is of the order of 1, the leading-order solution to Eq. (5.41) is given by

$$y(x) = \left(\frac{qF\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^4 |s_5|} \right)^{3/4} x^{3/2} \,. \tag{5.52}$$

One can take into account the next-to-leading order correction $\epsilon(x)$ by expressing the solution in the form $y(x) = y_0(x)[1 - \epsilon(x)]$, where $y_0(x)$ is the leading-order term (5.52). Integrating Eq. (5.41) under the condition $|\epsilon(x)| \ll 1$, we obtain $\epsilon(x) = [1 - \mu\mathcal{C}\exp(-\mu x^{3/2})]/(\mu x^{3/2})$, where $\mu = [q\lambda_1^{12}|s_5|^3/(\lambda_2^3 s_4^4 F^3)]^{1/4}/9$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is an integration constant. The correction $\epsilon(x)$ decreases for increasing x, so $y(x)$ approaches the leading-order solution (5.52).

The solution (5.52) is valid only in the case where r_2 given by Eq. (5.43) is smaller than r_s. This translates to the following condition

$$|s_5| > \frac{F\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^4} \frac{(24|s_4|)^{4/3}}{|q|^{1/3}} \,. \tag{5.53}$$

For the Sun with q, s_4 of the order of 1, this condition corresponds to $|s_5| > \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$. If $|s_5|$ is smaller than the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.53), then the solution (5.42) directly connects to the constant $y(x)$ solution around $r = r_s$. In this latter case ($|s_5| < \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$ for the Sun), the field profile is similar to that for $s_5 = 0$.

In what follows, we derive the field solution under the condition (5.53). For $r \gtrsim r_s$, the exponential term e^{-x^2/ξ_t^2} leads to the suppression of the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.41), so $y(x)$ approaches a constant. Matching this solution with Eq. (5.52) at $r = r_s$, we obtain the following solution for the distance $r_s \lesssim r < r_V$:

$$y(x) = \left(\frac{qF\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^4 |s_5|} \right)^{3/4} \,. \tag{5.54}$$

The Vainshtein radius r_V corresponds to the distance at which the condition (5.24) starts to be violated, i.e.,

$$r_V = 2\sqrt{6} \left(\frac{qFs_4^2}{\lambda_2^3 |s_5|} \right)^{1/4} r_s \,. \tag{5.55}$$

Matching Eq. (5.54) with the solution $y(x) \propto 1/x^6$ at $r = r_V$, the solution for $r > r_V$ reads

$$y(x) = \left(\frac{qF\lambda_2}{\lambda_1^4 |s_5|} \right)^{3/4} \left(\frac{r_V}{r_s} \right)^6 \frac{1}{x^6} \,. \tag{5.56}$$

We recall that, for $s_5 = 0$, the field solution is given by $y(x) \simeq q/(24 s_4)$ for the distance $r_s < r < r_V$. On using the solution (5.54), the ratio between $\phi'(r)$ for the $s_5 < 0$ case and the $s_5 = 0$ case is given by

$$\frac{\phi'(r)|_{s_5<0}}{\phi'(r)|_{s_5=0}} = 24^{1/3} \left(\frac{F^3}{q}\right)^{1/12} \frac{\lambda_2^{1/4}}{\lambda_1} \frac{s_4^{1/3}}{|s_5|^{1/4}}\,, \tag{5.57}$$

in the regime $r_s \lesssim r < r_V$. For the Sun with q, s_4 of the order of 1, the r.h.s. of Eq. (5.57) can be estimated as $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})|s_5|^{-1/4}$. Under the condition (5.53), i.e., $|s_5| > \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$, $\phi'(r)|_{s_5<0}$ is smaller than $\phi'(r)|_{s_5=0}$. For increasing $|s_5|$, both $\phi'(r)|_{s_5<0}$ and r_V decrease in proportion to $|s_5|^{-1/4}$.

The case (d) shown in Fig. 1 corresponds to the field profile for $c_5 = d_5 = -1.0$. As estimated above, the field derivative in the regime $r_s \lesssim r < r_V$ is suppressed relative to the $s_5 = 0$ case. In the case (d) of Fig. 1, the transition from the solution (5.42) to another solution (5.52) occurs at the distance r_2 much smaller than r_s. In the regime $r_2 < r \lesssim r_s$ the field derivative increases as $\phi'(r) \propto r^{1/2}$, whose growth rate is smaller than that for $s_5 = 0$ ($\phi'(r) \propto r$). This is the reason why the negative values of s_5 lead to the suppression of $\phi'(r)$ for the distance r larger than r_2.

Since the constant solution of $\phi'(r)$ in the range $r_s \lesssim r < r_V$ is smaller than that for $s_5 = 0$, the model with $s_5 < 0$ is consistent with local gravity constraints. For the distance $r_2 < r \lesssim r_s$, the solutions to gravitational potentials are given by Eqs. (5.28) and (5.29) with $m^2 = (qF\lambda_2/|s_5|)^{1/4}\lambda_2^2 M_{\rm pl}/r_s$ and $p = 1/2$. For the Sun with q, c_4, d_4 of the order of 1, the second, third, fourth, and fifth terms on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (5.28) and (5.29) can be estimated as $10^{-20}|s_5|^{-1/4}$, $10^{-47}|s_5|^{-1/2}$, $10^{-29}|s_5|^{-1}$, and $10^{-22}|s_5|^{-1/4}$, respectively, around $r = r_s$. Under the condition (5.53), i.e., $|s_5| > \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$, these terms are significantly smaller than 1. If $|s_5| < \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$, the solution to gravitational potentials is similar to that for $s_5 = 0$. Thus, the model with $s_5 < 0$ is compatible with the solar-system bound (5.32).

6 Conclusions

We have investigated the problems of the conical singularity and the screening mechanism in full GLPV theories. If the deviation parameter $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ from Horndeski theories approaches a non-zero constant at the center of a compact body (in the presence of a spherically symmetric background and in the absence of a shift-symmetry for the scalar field ϕ), the conical singularity arises at $r = 0$ due to a geometric modification of the four-dimensional Ricci scalar R. Using the general expansions of Φ, Ψ, and ϕ around $r = 0$, which are valid for compact objects with a regular boundary condition $\phi'(r = 0) = 0$, we have shown that curvature scalar quantities (including R) remain finite if and only if the 0-th order term Φ_0 and the 1-st order terms Φ_1, Ψ_1 vanish identically. The appearance of the conical singularity is associated with the non-vanishing value of Φ_0 induced by $\alpha_{\rm H4}$.

We have studied the effect of the Lagrangian L_5 on the problem of the conical singularity. The function G_5 given by Eq. (4.1) not only accommodates most of the theories proposed in the literature, but it also corresponds to the expansion of the regular function G_5 around $r = 0$. In this case, the functions A_5 and B_5 are of the forms (4.3) and (4.4), respectively. We showed that the Lagrangian L_5 inside the Horndeski domain ($F_5 = 0$) does not affect the conical singularity induced by non-zero $\alpha_{\rm H4}$.

In GLPV theories, there is a freedom for choosing the more general regular function A_5 in the form (4.12). Then, the solutions to gravitational potentials around $r = 0$ can be

expressed as Eqs. (4.13)-(4.14) up to linear order in r. Even if it is possible to fix $\Phi_0 = 0$ by the boundary condition for the function (4.12) with $\alpha_{\rm H4} \neq 0$, there are non-vanishing contributions from $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ to the gravitational potentials (to Φ_1 and Ψ_1) which lead to the divergence of curvature quantities at $r = 0$. Thus, the curvature singularity originating from the non-zero $\alpha_{\rm H4}$ cannot be removed by the GLPV Lagrangian L_5. Conversely, the GLPV Lagrangian L_5 alone does not give rise to any additional curvature singularity. In other words, the term L_4 is the only one responsible for the presence of the curvature singularity in the case $\alpha_{\rm H4}(r \to 0) \neq 0$.

In the presence of a non-minimal coupling between ϕ and R, we also derived the field profile and the gravitational potentials inside and outside the body under the approximation of weak gravity. We focused on the theories given by the functions (5.10), in which case no curvature singularities arise at $r = 0$. In GLPV theories there is a specific model characterized by $s_5 = 8c_5 + 15d_5 = 0$, where the contribution from the Lagrangian L_5 to the field equation vanishes identically. In this case the solutions to the gravitational potentials are similar to those for the theories with $L_5 = 0$, so that the model can be consistent with solar-system constraints under the operation of the Vainshtein mechanism.

If the parameter s_5 is positive and the condition (5.48) is violated, the field derivative $\phi'(r)$ exhibits divergent behavior in high-density regions. As long as s_5 is smaller than the order of $s_5^{\rm max}$, the screening mechanism can be at work inside and outside the body. If $s_5 < 0$ (which also includes, in particular, the Horndeski case, $d_5 = 0$ with $c_5 < 0$), then the field derivative is suppressed relative to the $s_5 = 0$ case due to the existence of the intermediate solution (5.52) inside the body (see the case (d) of Fig. 1). In this case, the model is compatible with the solar-system bound (5.32).

We have thus shown that there are models in which local gravity constraints can be satisfied in the framework of full GLPV theories involving the Lagrangian L_5, while the curvature singularity is absent at $r = 0$. It will be of interest to study whether or not such models are cosmologically viable in connection to the dark energy problem. We leave this for a future work.

Acknowledgments

RK is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up of the JSPS No. 15H06635. ST is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the JSPS No. 24540286, MEXT KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas "Cosmic Acceleration" (No. 15H05890), and the cooperation program between Tokyo University of Science and CSIC.

References

[1] A. G. Riess *et al.*, Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].

[2] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].

[3] A. Silvestri and M. Trodden, Rept. Prog. Phys. **72**, 096901 (2009) [arXiv:0904.0024 [astro-ph.CO]].

[4] S. Tsujikawa, Lect. Notes Phys. **800**, 99 (2010) [arXiv:1101.0191 [gr-qc]].

[5] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, Phys. Rept. **513**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO]].

[6] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).

[7] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006) [hep-th/0603057].

[8] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).

[9] Y. Fujii and K. Maeda, "The Scalar-Tensor Theory of Gravitation", Cambridge University Press (2003).

[10] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084003 (2009) [arXiv:0901.1314 [hep-th]].

[11] M. V. Ostrogradski, Mem. Acad. St. Petersbourg VI 4, **385** (1850).

[12] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 064039 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].

[13] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 10, 363-384 (1974).

[14] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. 'i. Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **126**, 511 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].

[15] C. Charmousis, E. J. Copeland, A. Padilla and P. M. Saffin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 051101 (2012). [arXiv:1106.2000 [hep-th]].

[16] X. Gao and D. A. Steer, JCAP **1112**, 019 (2011) [arXiv:1107.2642 [astro-ph.CO]].

[17] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 083504 (2011) [arXiv:1107.3917 [gr-qc]].

[18] A. De Felice, T. Kobayashi and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Lett. B **706**, 123 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4242 [gr-qc]].

[19] R. Kimura, T. Kobayashi and K. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 024023 (2012) [arXiv:1111.6749 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, Phys. Rev. **117**, 1595 (1960).

[21] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza, and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **1308**, 025 (2013) [arXiv:1304.4840 [hep-th]].

[22] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114** (2015) 21, 211101 [arXiv:1404.6495 [hep-th]].

[23] C. Lin, S. Mukohyama, R. Namba and R. Saitou, JCAP **1410**, 071 (2014) [arXiv:1408.0670 [hep-th]].

[24] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **1502**, 018 (2015) [arXiv:1408.1952 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] X. Gao, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 104033 (2014) [arXiv:1409.6708 [gr-qc]].

[26] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and D. A. Steer, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 084013 (2015) [arXiv:1506.01974 [gr-qc]].

[27] R. Kase, L. A. Gergely and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 124019 (2014) [arXiv:1406.2402 [hep-th]].

[28] T. Kobayashi, Y. Watanabe and D. Yamauchi, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 064013 (2015) [arXiv:1411.4130 [gr-qc]].

[29] K. Koyama and J. Sakstein, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 124066 (2015) [arXiv:1502.06872 [astro-ph.CO]].

[30] R. Saito, D. Yamauchi, S. Mizuno, J. Gleyzes and D. Langlois, JCAP **1506**, 008 (2015) [arXiv:1503.01448 [gr-qc]].

[31] J. B. Jimenez, F. Piazza and H. Velten, arXiv:1507.05047 [gr-qc].

[32] A. De Felice, R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1508.06364 [gr-qc] (`Physical Review D to appear`).

[33] J. Sakstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 201101 (2015) [arXiv:1510.05964 [astro-ph.CO]].

[34] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 044073 (2014) [arXiv:1407.0794 [hep-th]].

[35] A. De Felice, K. Koyama and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1505**, 058 (2015) [arXiv:1503.06539 [gr-qc]].

[36] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, M. Mancarella and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **1508**, 054 (2015) [arXiv:1504.05481 [astro-ph.CO]].

[37] S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 044029 (2015) [arXiv:1505.02459 [astro-ph.CO]].

[38] L. Perenon, F. Piazza, C. Marinoni and L. Hui, JCAP **1511**, 029 (2015) [arXiv:1506.03047 [astro-ph.CO]].

[39] S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 064047 (2015) [arXiv:1506.08561 [gr-qc]].

[40] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, M. Mancarella and F. Vernizzi, arXiv:1509.02191 [astro-ph.CO].

[41] R. Kase, S. Tsujikawa and A. De Felice, arXiv:1510.06853 [gr-qc] (`Physical Review D to appear`).

[42] E. Babichev and C. Deffayet, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 184001 (2013) [arXiv:1304.7240 [gr-qc]].

[43] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].

[44] R. Gannouji and M. Sami, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 024011 (2010) [arXiv:1004.2808 [gr-qc]].

[45] C. Burrage and D. Seery, JCAP **1008**, 011 (2010) [arXiv:1005.1927 [astro-ph.CO]].

[46] P. Brax, C. Burrage and A. C. Davis, JCAP **1109**, 020 (2011) [arXiv:1106.1573 [hep-ph]].

[47] A. De Felice, R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 044059 (2012) [arXiv:1111.5090 [gr-qc]].

[48] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **39**, 393 (1972).

[49] K. Koyama, G. Niz and G. Tasinato, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 021502 (2013) [arXiv:1305.0279 [hep-th]].

[50] R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1308**, 054 (2013) [arXiv:1306.6401 [gr-qc]].

[51] L. A. Gergely and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 064059 (2014) [arXiv:1402.0553 [hep-th]].

[52] S. Tsujikawa, Lect. Notes Phys. **892**, 97 (2015) [arXiv:1404.2684 [gr-qc]].

[53] L. Amendola, Phys. Lett. B **301**, 175 (1993) [gr-qc/9302010].

[54] C. Germani and A. Kehagias, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 011302 (2010) [arXiv:1003.2635 [hep-ph]].

[55] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1202**, 007 (2012) [arXiv:1110.3878 [gr-qc]].

[56] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 111301 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2700 [astro-ph.CO]].

[57] C. M. Will, Living Rev. Rel. **9**, 3 (2006) [gr-qc/0510072].